Table C-83b. Percentage distribution of Federal obligations for research and development to each State for selected agencies, by performer: fiscal year 1999

Page 1 of 2

State (in order of total Federal research & development obligations)	Total	Intra- mural ¹	Extramural						
			Industrial firms	FFRDCs admin by industrial firms	Univer- sities and colleges	FFRDCs admin by univs and colleges	Other non- profit institu- tions	FFRDCs admin by nonprofit institu- tions	State and local govts
Total	100.0	23.6	43.1	1.8	20.0	5.3	4.5	1.2	0.4
California	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	11.2 59.5 31.2 15.2 16.4	56.1 25.2 59.2 61.7 69.0	.1 1.9 .1 .0	13.3 11.0 4.6 20.8 10.8	14.7 * 1.1 .0 *	3.7 2.3 1.0 2.0 3.6	.8 * 2.7 .1 .0	.1 .1 .3 .2
Massachusetts New York New Jersey District of Columbia Florida	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	7.7 4.9 18.3 78.0 33.4	29.6 27.0 70.5 7.1 50.8	.0 .0 .0	28.6 45.6 8.6 6.4 14.5	5.9 * 1.5 .0 .0	25.7 10.2 .6 8.3 .7	2.4 9.3 .2 *	.2 2.9 .2 .2
New Mexico	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	19.8 13.8 8.8 42.7 16.5	8.1 70.3 31.4 42.3 43.3	33.7 .0 .0 .0	5.1 14.9 50.0 13.8 20.8	31.9 .0 .9 .0 5.4	1.1 .7 8.5 .9 4.3	.0 .0 .0 .0 9.3	.2 .4 .2 .5
Illinois	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	5.9 14.6 15.2 22.9 5.2	9.4 28.1 63.2 13.4 54.3	.0 .0 .0 .0	44.6 31.9 16.8 56.0 37.4	34.3 .0 3.4 .0	5.2 13.4 .9 7.1 2.6	.0 11.6 .0 .0	.6 .2 .5 .5
Minnesota Michigan Tennessee Connecticut Indiana	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	4.3 17.8 9.5 2.7 13.3	57.6 19.8 7.8 47.2 35.6	.0 .0 46.7 .0	24.7 59.8 29.4 46.6 49.5	.0 .0 1.1 .0	12.7 1.9 5.0 2.5 .5	.0 .0 .0 .0	.7 .7 .5 1.1 1.1
Oregon Rhode Island Wisconsin Mississippi Utah	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	21.9 59.4 10.9 55.8 24.3	21.2 14.1 5.1 21.9 20.1	.0 .0 .0 .0	48.8 17.5 78.9 19.7 53.1	.0 .0 .0 .0	6.1 8.6 3.9 1.6 1.3	.0 .0 .0 .0	2.0 .4 1.2 .9 1.3
New Hampshire	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	9.7 10.0 14.9 51.2 26.9	61.1 78.7 6.5 18.8 5.0	.0 .0 .0 .0	27.5 10.2 68.1 12.5 62.9	.0 .0 7.8 14.6 .0	.6 .5 1.5 2.1 1.9	.0 .0 .0 .0	1.1 .6 1.3 .8 3.4
South Carolinaldaho HawaiiKansas Oklahoma	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	20.9 13.7 32.5 18.7 27.7	14.1 29.3 25.5 35.6 23.5	13.3 45.6 .0 .0	50.2 10.5 29.6 42.9 38.2	.0 .0 .0 .0	.7 .1 11.0 .7 8.9	.0 .0 .0	.9 .8 1.5 2.1 1.7
Maine Kentucky Alaska Arkansas Montana	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	3.3 6.2 46.3 43.3 44.9	58.1 29.8 14.0 1.6 5.3	.0 .0 .0 .0	13.6 59.5 33.3 48.7 37.2	.0 .0 .0 .0	23.4 .4 1.7 3.7 8.7	.0 .0 .0 .0	1.7 4.0 4.6 2.6 4.0
Nebraska	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	30.6 6.6 51.0 5.3 53.2	3.0 16.0 2.7 20.4 16.0	.0 .0 .0 .0	59.2 72.1 42.6 66.3 27.2	.0 .0 .0 .0	5.5 2.8 1.5 5.5 .9	.0 .0 .0 .0	1.7 2.5 2.2 2.5 2.7

See explanatory information, if any, and SOURCE at end of table. $\label{eq:solution}$

Table C-83b. Percentage distribution of Federal obligations for research and development to each State for selected agencies, by performer: fiscal year 1999

Page 2 of 2

State (in order of total Federal research & development obligations)	Total	Intra- mural ¹	Extramural						
			Industrial firms	FFRDCs admin by industrial firms	Univer- sities and colleges	FFRDCs admin by univs and colleges	Other non- profit institu- tions	FFRDCs admin by nonprofit institu- tions	State and local govts
Wyoming	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	44.0 41.4 11.8 77.2 95.4	5.8	.0 * .0 0.1 .0	41.2 42.7 69.7 10.3 1.1	.0 6.6 12.0 .0	9.1 * * .0 .1	.0 .0 .0 .0	3.0 .4 .8 *

Includes costs associated with the administration of intramural and extramural programs by Federal personnel as well as actual intramural

NOTE:

Only the following 10 agencies are required to report to this section of the survey: the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Energy, Health and Human Services, Interior, and Transportation; the Environmental Protection Agency; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and the National Science Foundation. The obligations of the 10 major R&D supporting agencies included in this table represent approximately 98 percent of total Federal R&D obligations in fiscal year 1999.

KEY:

* = Amount less than 0.5 percent FFRDCs = Federally funded research and development centers

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Studies, Survey of Federal Funds for Research and Development: Fiscal Years 1999, 2000, and 2001